4.0 DRAFT SECTION 4(F) EVALUATION

4.1 Purpose of Section 4(f) Evaluation

Section 4(f) of the U.S. DOT Act of 1966 (49 USC 303[c]) requires that the proposed use of any land within a publicly owned park or recreation area, wildlife and waterfowl refuge, or historic site that is on or considered eligible for the NRHP be given particular attention. Final action requiring the use of such land must document that there are no feasible and prudent alternatives to its use. Additionally, a full evaluation of measures to minimize harm to that resource must be made and documented. Section 4(f) applies to this proposed project because federal funds would be used, and the project would require use of land from Section 4(f) resources.

The use of a Section 4(f) resource occurs when (1) land from a Section 4(f) site is permanently acquired for a transportation project, (2) there is temporary occupancy of land that is adverse in terms of the statute's preservation purpose, or (3) the proximity impacts of the transportation project on the Section 4(f) site, without acquisition of land, are so great that the purposes for which Section 4(f) exists are substantially impaired. The latter "use" is also referred to as constructive use. Constructive use occurs when the transportation project does not incorporate land from a 4(f) resource, but the proximity impacts are so severe that the activities, features, or attributes that qualify a resource for protection under section 4(f) are substantially impaired. Section 4(f) is applicable to historic sites and archaeological resources when the resource is included on, or eligible for, the NRHP (23 CFR § 771.135[e]). Section 4(f) does not apply to archaeological sites where it is determined after consultation with the SHPO and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) that the resource is important chiefly because of what can be learned by data recovery and has minimal value for preservation in place (23 CFR § 771.135[g][2]). Constructive use does not occur when compliance with the requirements of Section 106 of the NHPA (16 USC § 470) and related regulations for proximity impacts of a proposed project on an NRHP eligible site results in a finding of "no effect" or "no adverse effect" (36 CFR § 800.5).

As noted, the proposed project is within the BMU of the SBNF. The BMU is managed for range/wildlife, recreation, and watershed uses and falls under the "multiple use" provisions of Section 4(f). Title 23 CFR § 771.135(d) states that:

> *Where Federal lands or other public land holdings (e.g., State forests) are administered under statutes permitting management for multiple uses, and, in fact, are managed for multiple uses, Section 4(f) applies only to those portions of such lands which function for, or are designated in the plans of the administering agency as being for, significant park, recreation, or wildlife and waterfowl purposes. The determination as to which lands so function or are so designated, and the significance of those lands, shall be made by the officials having jurisdiction over the lands. The Administration will review this determination to assure its reasonableness. The determination of significance shall apply to the entire area of such park, recreation, or wildlife and waterfowl refuge sites.*

This Section 4(f) evaluation describes the proposed action, identifies Section 4(f) resources in the project area, describes the nature and extent of the use of these resources, evaluates alternatives that would avoid the use of Section 4(f) resources, and describes measures to minimize harm to the affected resources.

4.2 Proposed Action

4.2.1 Introduction

Bautista Canyon Road, FH 224, traverses the western portion of the BMU in the SBNF. The roadway provides north-south linkage between SH 74 in Valle Vista to the north and SH 371 in Anza to the south. In addition, USDAFS and fire/emergency medical vehicles use the roadway to access Bautista Canyon during emergencies. A 13.2 km (8.2 mi) segment of the roadway is narrow and unpaved, and contains many design and operation deficiencies that do not meet engineering standards. This unpaved segment has numerous sharp vertical and horizontal curves that limit sight distance. The road surface is also rough and washboarded, thus requiring regular maintenance. Furthermore, the road crosses Bautista Creek and numerous other drainages and becomes impassible during high flow events.

The proposed project would realign and pave the 13.2 km (8.2 mi) segment of Bautista Canyon Road consistent with current design standards and regulatory requirements. The roadway would be improved as a low-volume, two-lane rural collector

4.2.2 Purpose of and Need for Project

The purpose of and need for the project is based on the condition of the existing roadway, which prevents it from functioning as an efficient link in the Riverside County transportation system. The currently unpaved segment of Bautista Canyon Road contains many operational deficiencies that require considerable maintenance and impede safe access to and through a portion of the SBNF. A complete discussion of the purpose of and need for the project is provided in Section 1.4 of this EIS/EIR and is incorporated herein by reference.

4.2.3 Project Alternatives Using Section 4(f) Lands

A complete discussion of the project alternatives is provided in Chapter 2 and is incorporated herein by reference. A listing of these alternatives is provided below (see Section 2.2 for details).

- Alternative A – 40 km/h (25 mph) Design Speed
- Alternative B – 55 km/h (35 mph) Design Speed
- Alternative C – Combination 55/40/55 km/h (35/25/35 mph) Design Speed
- Alternative D – No Action

Alternatives A, B, and C have varying alignments based on proposed design speeds. Alternative C has been designated as the preferred alternative. Under alternative C, the design

speed varies depending on topography. These design considerations are intended to maximize the functionality of the proposed roadway while minimizing adverse environmental effects.

Alternative A – 40 km/h (25 mph) Design Speed

The roadway would be paved for two lanes of traffic, one lane in each direction, with a pavement width of 7.8 m (26 ft) (see Figure 2.2-6). The total length of this alternative is approximately 12.3 km (7.6 mi) (see Figures 2.2-1 through 2.2-3). The proposed design speed for Alternative A is 40 km/h (25 mph). Alternative A would require approximately 225,000 m^3 (294,300 yd^3) of excavation and would result in approximately 16.1 ha (39.8 ac) of new disturbance (see Table 2.2-2). Alternative A would result in cut and fill slopes of up to 25 m (80 ft) in height. For 2025 conditions, the Bautista Canyon Road ADT volumes are projected to increase to levels that are between 1,100 and 1,800 vehicles per day depending upon location. These 2025 traffic volume projections are well within the capacity of a two-lane rural collector.

Alternative B – 55 km/h (35 mph) Design Speed

The roadway would be paved for two lanes of traffic, one lane in each direction, with a pavement width of 7.8 m (26 ft) (see Figure 2.2-6). The total length of this alternative is approximately 12.1 km (7.5 mi) (see Figures 2.2-1 through 2.2-3). The proposed design speed for Alternative B is 55 km/h (35 mph) (see Figures 2.2-1 through 2.2-3). Alternative B would require approximately 303,000 m^3 (396,400 yd^3) of excavation and would result in approximately 17.9 ha (44.2 ac) of new disturbance (see Table 2.2-2). Alternative B would result in cut and fill slopes of up to 25 m (80 ft) in height.

Alternative C – Combination 55/40/55 km/h (35/25/35 mph) Design Speed

The roadway would be paved for two lanes of traffic, one lane in each direction, with a pavement width of 7.8 m (26 ft) (see Figure 2.2-6). The total length of this alternative is approximately 12.3 km (7.6 mi) (see Figures 2.2-1 through 2.2-3). As noted, the study area was divided into three segments based on terrain. Under Alternative C, design speeds were incorporated accordingly to maximize travel efficiency while minimizing resource disturbance. Alternative C would incorporate a 55 km/h (35 mph) design speed in Segments 1 and 3 of Bautista Canyon Road where the terrain is flatter and a 40 km/h (25 mph) along Segment 2 where the terrain is mountainous. Implementation of Alternative C would require approximately 235,000 m^3 (307,400 yd^3) of excavation and would result in approximately 16.6 ha (41.0 ac) of new disturbance (see Table 2.2-2). Alternative C would result in cut and fill slopes of up to 25 m (80 ft) in height.

Alternative D – No Action (No Project)

The No Action (No Project) alternative is characterized as a "no-build" alternative. Under this alternative, no road improvements are proposed and Bautista Canyon Road would not be paved or realigned. Therefore, Alternative D would avoid the use of Section 4(f) resources. Although this alternative does not involve use of land from Section 4(f) resources, it does have indirect

impacts on those resources. The existing road and traffic conditions along Bautista Canyon Road are expected to worsen as traffic volumes increase. Current maintenance of the roadway would continue and adequate maintenance would become increasingly expensive as the deficient aspects of the road remain unrepaired.

4.2.4 Other Alternatives Using Section 4(f) Lands, Considered, but Eliminated

The alternatives discussed below were evaluated and found not to be prudent because they are inadequate in terms of engineering design, traffic safety, or ineffectiveness in meeting other project goals and objectives. Based on these findings, the alternatives were eliminated from further review for the reasons described below. The alternatives that avoid some or all impacts are discussed under each Section 4(f) resource.

- Proposed Variations to Build Alternatives
- Pave Existing Bautista Canyon Road
- Reconstruct and No Pave
- New Route Using Existing Streets
- New Route Through Bautista Canyon
- 25 or 32 km/h (15 or 20 mph) Design Speed for Entire Route
- Alternative Transit
- Limited Access Alternative

Proposed Variations to Build Alternatives

Alternatives A, B, and C have undergone a review process to examine potential effects to biological, cultural, and other resources. Where practicable, alternatives were revised to reflect more environmentally sensitive alignment variations within each alternative.

Ridge #1 Alignments: The existing roadway through this area descends into the drainage for Bautista Creek and crosses the creek with a low water crossing (see Figure 2.2-1). The existing alignment contains multiple sharp horizontal curves that could not accommodate the proposed design speeds.

Originally, there were two alignment alternatives at the Bautista Creek crossing (Ridge #1) in addition to the proposed alignment. One was a straight crossing that cut off the existing horseshoe alignment. This alignment bridged the creek drainage by continuing southeast where the existing road turns sharply to the north (the beginning of the “horseshoe”) and then reconnected at the eastern end of the “horseshoe.” In an effort to avoid impacts to wetlands, a second alignment (the “no bridge” alignment) was identified, which closely followed the existing alignment based on a 40 km/h (25 mph) design speed. The “no bridge” alignment shifted to the north along the ridgeline and then turned east to cross Bautista Creek and one other large drainage. It then reconnected with the existing roadway approximately 200 meters to the southeast of the end of the existing “horseshoe.” Preliminary review of these alignments indicated that each would result in unacceptable negative impacts to environmental resources.

Therefore they were not prudent. As a result, the proposed alignment was identified for this location and these early Ridge #1 alignments were eliminated from further review.

Ridge #2 Alignment: Ridge #2 is the location of another existing "horseshoe" curve that needs to be realigned to accommodate the 40 km/h (25 mph) design speed (see Figure 2.2-2). The original design followed the existing roadway alignment on the north side of the hill along Bautista Creek (the top of the "horseshoe"). This alignment impacted wetlands and had a negative impact on wildlife. In order to reduce these impacts, the proposed alignment at Ridge #2 was shifted to the south of the hill along a natural drainage channel grade, eliminating the impacts to the wetlands and other environmental resources. Consequently, the earlier Ridge #2 alignment was eliminated from analysis in the EIS/EIR.

Pave Existing Bautista Canyon Road

Paving the existing road alignment was considered but eliminated because it would not meet the project's objectives to improve safety and emergency access. The existing roadway was not engineered to current standards and is too narrow in several locations for vehicles to pass safely. Furthermore, basic roadway geometry is poor, with numerous sharp horizontal and vertical curves that limit sight distance. Additionally, roadway drainage is poor and road washouts and rockfalls caused by storm water runoff and seasonal flooding at the low-water crossings of Bautista Creek and other drainages would prevent use of the road during storm events. Paving the existing route would leave these deficiencies in place and would not be an appropriate use of federal funds because suitable design standards would not be achieved and it would not accomplish the purpose of or satisfy the need for the proposed project. This alternative is not prudent.

Reconstruct and No Pave

Implementation of this alternative would involve reconstructing the roadway to one of the build alternative standards; however, the surface would not be paved. This alternative was eliminated because it would result in equal direct environmental effects as the build alternatives and greater indirect effects resulting from the unpaved surface. This alternative would not adequately address maintenance needs because the unpaved surface would continue to require regular maintenance to maintain a safe, smooth driving surface. Thus, implementation of this alternative would not accomplish the purpose of or satisfy the need for the project and does not reduce or eliminate impacts to Section 4(f) properties

New Route Using Existing Streets

A new route using roads such as SH 371 to SH 74 to the east or SH 371 to Wilson Valley Road/Sage Road/State Street to the west was considered. The existing traffic levels on Bautista Canyon Road are very low. At the Bautista Conservation Camp the traffic volume is only 88 vehicles per day on a Saturday, while at the north end of the project east of Fairview avenue the volume is 134 on the same day. This indicates that the through traffic volume is very low. Because taking the alternate route (using State Highways 74/371) is already faster than the existing road, and the very low volume of traffic of Bautista Canyon Road, it is reasonable to assume that all or virtually all of the traffic on Bautista Canyon Road is there for

recreation or sightseeing rather than through traffic. Therefore, it is unlikely that implementing the New Route Using Existing Streets Alternative would take any traffic off Bautista Canyon Road. This alternative was eliminated from further consideration because it would not improve access to the SBNF or provide a more efficient link between Valle Vista and Anza. The existing road and traffic conditions along Bautista Canyon Road are expected to worsen as traffic volumes increase. Current roadway maintenance would continue and adequate maintenance would become increasingly more expensive as the deficient aspects of the road remain unrepaired. This alternative is not prudent.

New Route Through Bautista Canyon

A completely new alignment through Bautista Canyon was considered. This alternative was eliminated because construction of a new road would have greater environmental effects than those projected for reconstruction of the existing Bautista Canyon Road. Additionally, the SBNF opposed implementation of this alternative. Table 2.2-2 shows the amount of existing roadway that is being utilized and the total amount of new disturbance from each of the build alternatives. A new route through Bautista Canyon would result in a significant increase in new disturbance over the build alternatives considered in this EIS/EIR, amplifying the potential for significant environmental effects. This alternative is not prudent.

25 or 32 km/h (15 or 20 mph) Design Speed for Entire Route

A 25 or 32 km/h (15 or 20 mph) design speed for Bautista Canyon Road was considered but eliminated after review of established design standards because the projected traffic volumes would be too high for this slow of a design speed. Projected traffic volumes indicate a rural collector classification, which require design speeds of 40-48 km/h (25-30 mph). Furthermore, environmental impacts would be similar to those identified for the proposed action due to the similarity in design criteria and the required curve widening needed to accommodate the design speed. Therefore, no advantage (environmental or otherwise) would be realized by selecting this alternative. This alternative is not prudent.

Alternative Transit

Alternative means of transit were considered and eliminated from further consideration because of the remote location and the lack of connectivity to other existing mass transit facilities. Additionally, current deficiencies make this unusable as a transit route. As such, transit or other modes of transportation would not meet project objectives, including the provision of a safe vehicle travel route and improved access for emergency vehicles. This alternative is not prudent.

Limited Access Alternative

Bautista Canyon Road would be limited to Forest Service access and Native American plant collection from just south of the Conservation camp to just north of Tripp Flats Road. Cul-de-sacs would be constructed at these locations along with access gates. The Forest Service would control the gates at these locations and would coordinate with the Native Americans concerning their access. Alternative routes, SH 74 to SH 371 and/or State Street to Sage Road,

would be improved to handle the additional traffic volume diverted from Bautista Canyon Road. The degree of improvements to these roadways would be determined based on the existing roadway's ability to handle the additional traffic.

This alternative is not prudent because it would remove a transportation link in the County's circulation system which is inconsistent with the County's General Plan, specifically with REMAP policy 8.1 and 8.7; it would remove one potential access route out of the Anza Valley in the event of a fire; it would not provide an improved road surface that would allow for faster travel by fire-fighting equipment, improved access by Forest Service enforcement vehicles, and County Sheriff vehicles; it would not allow the public to travel by automobile through a portion of the SBNF that had been available and planned for such use and access to the existing Alessandro Trail would be restricted; and improvements to SR 74/SR 371 and/or State Street/Sage Road would have potentially significant environmental impacts which would have to be addressed.

4.3 Section 4(f) Resources

There are five primary Section 4(f) properties involved with the proposed action that are found within the project area:

- Juan Bautista de Anza National Historic Trail
- Alessandro Trail
- Bautista Canyon Archaeological District
- Anza NHT Historic Transportation Corridor
- Bautista Canyon Ethnobotanical Traditional Cultural Property

4.3.1 Park Land and Recreation

Juan Bautista de Anza National Historic Trail (Anza NHT)

Affected Environment

The Anza NHT is considered a recreation resource under Section 4(f). It is also part of the historic transportation corridor. Impacts to the historic transportation corridor are discussed below in Section 4.3.2. In 1990, Congress acknowledged the significance of the Anza expeditions by establishing the Anza NHT. The Anza NHT was established to commemorate the Spanish colonizing expeditions from Sonora, Mexico, into Upper California in the 1770s. In August 1990, Congress passed Public Law 101-365 making the Juan Bautista de Anza National Historic Trail (Anza NHT) a component of the National Trails System, to be administered by the National Parks Service (NPS). The Anza NHT is an historic route that consists of "recreational trail" components and "auto route" components. A designated recreational trail consists of existing trails that are linked up along the historic route. Linked trails serve as a Recreational Trail Retracement Route. Of the 1,200 mi length of the Anza NHT from Nogales, Arizona, to San Francisco, California, 161 mi are components that cross federal lands. The historic route enters Riverside County from the south via Coyote Canyon, crosses the Cahuilla Indian

Reservation, and descends to the Hemet/San Jacinto area via Bautista Canyon. The route follows the San Jacinto River to Mystic Lake, then through the Bernasconi Pass near Perris Lake State Recreation Area, passes through March Air Force Base to enter the urbanized area of Riverside today. It crosses the Santa Ana River and proceeds westerly through Pedley toward Mission San Gabriel (NPS1996: C-17).

The only trail component through a national forest is the 8 mi segment of Bautista Canyon Road that passes through the SBNF (i.e., the location of the proposed project). Here, the Anza NHT consists of a designated auto route (marked) but no recreational trail. Because this currently unpaved section of the trail route crosses federal lands in an area that is little changed from the 1774-1776 landscape that Anza's expeditions traversed, it has been identified as 1 of 17 "high-potential" segments "to interpret the trail's historical significance and to provide opportunities for high-quality recreation" (NPS 1996: 1-2, 20-23). The designated auto route (marked) through Bautista Canyon follows S22 to SR 79 north, to SR 371 west, and to Bautista Canyon Road. Bautista Canyon Road becomes Fairview Avenue. The auto route follows Fairview Avenue to Florida Avenue, turns west on Florida Avenue to the Ramona Expressway to I-215 northwest, to SH 60.

There are no existing trails that serve the purpose of a recreational trail retracement route through Bautista Canyon. Current use of the unpaved portion of Bautista Canyon Road by pedestrians, equestrians, or bicyclists is passive at best. The Plan states that a bicycle route could follow existing Bautista Canyon Road. The City of Riverside Trails Master Plan identifies trails which approximate the historic route and which connect to the existing Santa Ana River National Recreation Trail. This river trail could be used to skirt highly urbanized areas in San Bernardino County to connect with the County of Los Angeles Schabarum Trail via planned open space on the San Bernardino-Orange County line south of the Chino Hills. According to the Comprehensive Management and Use Plan for the Anza NHT, these trail connections could be marked as recreational links to the Anza NHT and would provide an off-road recreational experience of an environment somewhat similar to that Anza experienced (NPS 1996: C-17).

Environmental Consequences

Implementation of Alternatives A, B, or C would have temporary and permanent effects on the Anza NHT. The roadway would be temporarily closed for up to 16 months during construction under all the build alternatives. Thus, access to the NHT auto route would be restricted. The County of Riverside and FHWA will define an alternative route in consultation with the NPS and ensure appropriate signage is in place prior to initiating the road closure. The impact would be temporary and occur only during construction.

As discussed in Section 3.10, each build alternative would result in a visual impact. The proposed road would dominate the existing landscape in all aspects including form, line, color, and texture and it would change the landscape character of the canyon. The proposed cuts and fills would dominate as a negative feature along the road edges and change the natural form, line, color, and texture of the existing landscape, degrading the natural scenery of the canyon. Paving of this segment of the roadway would also reduce the rustic characteristic of the

roadway. Negative visual impacts, however, would be reduced by implementation of the mitigation measures recommended in Section 3.10.5.

Although paving of this segment of the roadway would reduce the rustic characteristic of the roadway, reconstruction and paving of the roadway should not diminish the ability to interpret the trail's historical significance. Moreover paving this segment of the roadway with a two-foot paved shoulder would provide a safer route for bicyclists and not preclude them from use of the road. The 13.2 km (8.2 mi) segment of Anza NHT is also an historic travel and auto route through Bautista Canyon. The improved roadway would provide a safer route for all users. It would increase the opportunity for more recreational users to access the canyon and experience the historic landscape that is relatively unchanged since the early explorations of the 1700s, although the proposed project will introduce some visual changes.

Proposed Alternatives A, B, and C include new roadway alignments based on varying design speeds. The unpaved roadway segment would be reconstructed and would be 1.8 to 3.0 m (6 to 10 ft) wider than the existing unpaved segment of the Anza NHT for all the build alternatives. The length of the existing unpaved trail component of the Anza NHT is 113.2 km (8.2 mi). Compared to the existing Anza NHT segment, Alternatives A and C would decrease the roadway length by 0.6 km (0.4 mi) and Alternative B would decrease the roadway length by 0.8 km (0.5 mi). The change in length of the Anza NHT would not detract from views of an unchanged landscape and potential to interpret the trail's historical significance along the auto route. Therefore the change in length is not a Section 4(f) impact.

All the build alternatives also propose a 0.1 ha (0.3 ac) interpretive overlook area on a point overlooking Bautista Canyon that would provide an opportunity for all users to have a panoramic view of the canyon and learn more about the historic use of the canyon (see Figure 2.2-5).

Avoidance Alternatives

Alternative D "No Action" would leave Bautista Canyon Road in its current condition, avoiding the temporary closure of this segment of the Anza NHT and the visual impacts to the historic landscape. The existing road and traffic conditions along Bautista Canyon Road are expected to worsen as traffic volumes increase. Current roadway maintenance would continue and adequate maintenance would become increasingly more expensive as the deficient aspects of the road remain unrepaired. This alternative is not prudent.

The Pave Existing Bautista Canyon Road Alternative would partially avoid the temporary closure of this segment of the Anza NHT by reducing or eliminating the time the road would need to be closed. The alternative would also partially avoid visual impacts; the only impact would be to the rustic characteristic of the roadway. However, this alternative is not prudent for the reasons indicated in Section 4.2.4 above.

The Reconstruct and No Pave Alternative would partially avoid visual impacts by maintaining a more rustic roadway surface. However, this alternative is not prudent for the reasons indicated in Section 4.2.4 above.

The New Route Using Existing Streets Alternative, utilizing existing roads such as SH 371 to SH 74 to the east or SH 371 to Wilson Valley Road/Sage Road/State Street to the west, would totally avoid impacts to the Anza NHT, similar to Alternative D. However, this alternative is not prudent for the reasons indicated in Section 4.2.4 above.

The Alternative Transit Alternative would avoid the temporary closure of this segment of the Anza NHT and the visual impacts to the historic landscape, similar to Alternative D. However, this alternative is not prudent for the reasons indicated in Section 4.2.4 above.

Measures to Minimize Harm

The visual effect of large fills can be reduced with appropriate revegetation. The proposed design minimizes cut and fill slopes; thus, reducing the project's footprint and the amount of new disturbance. All disturbed areas and abandoned road segments would be revegetated with plant species native to the canyon where possible. On steeper slopes and rock faces, rock coloring would be used to minimize visual effects. To minimize effects associated with the temporary closure of the Anza NHT auto route, the FHWA recommends signing an alternate route using SH 371 and/or 74. Specific details would be determined during consultation with the NPS. Measures to minimize adverse effects are described in detail in Section 3.10.5 (visual resources), and Section 3.11.5 (recreation).

Alessandro Trail

Affected Environment

The Alessandro Trail is a 24 km (15 mi) trail that begins at the top of Tripp Flats, just north of the Tripp Flats Forest Service Station at an elevation of approximately 1,200 m (4,000 ft) and approximately 1.6 km (1 mi) from Bautista Canyon Road. The trail proceeds down toward Bautista Creek and the CDC Bautista Conservation Camp at Bautista Canyon Road. OHV users mainly use this trail. The trailhead does not have a designated parking area. Trail users typically park along the roadside or in a small (one to two cars) dirt area that currently exists at the trailhead (see Figure 1.3-2).

Environmental Consequences

Implementation of Alternatives A, B, and C would have a beneficial effect for Alessandro Trail users under all these build alternatives. As noted in Section 2.2, the proposed build alternatives would include construction of a 0.1 ha (0.3 ac) OHV trailhead pullout at the Alessandro Trailhead (Figure 2.2-5). This facility would be surfaced with decomposed granite and sized to accommodate approximately five vehicles and trailers. A small informational bulletin board is also proposed. As noted above, the trailhead currently does not have a designated parking area. Thus, users are required to park along the roadside or in a small dirt area. The proposed parking area would improve user safety by minimizing conflicts between users loading/unloading OHV equipment and other motorists traveling on the roadway. Removal of

some scattered brush would occur as a result of clearing and grading for the pullout area. This would not adversely affect trail or user access during construction. Improved access to OHV and hiking areas within the SBNF may increase the number of users. It is assumed all users would be required to purchase Adventure Permits from the SBNF and comply with any restrictions and/or requirements. Activities would be restricted to daytime use; and thus, would be consistent with the SBNF LRMP recreation goal. Thus, while use of the area may change as a result of the project, no significant adverse impacts are anticipated.

Avoidance Alternatives

A trailhead pullout and parking area at the existing Alessandro Trail crossing would be included as part of all the proposed build alternatives. The only avoidance alternatives would be Alternative D "No Action," "New Route Using Existing Streets," "New Route Through Bautista Canyon," and "Alternative Transit." These alternatives would leave the unpaved segment of Bautista Canyon Road in its current condition. The existing deficient characteristics of the roadway would remain. User safety would not improve and fewer people would have the opportunity to use the Alessandro Trail. These alternatives would not be prudent.

Measures to Minimize Harm

All disturbed areas adjacent to the trailhead would be revegetated with appropriate seed mixes corresponding to the adjacent plant community. Construction of the OHV pullout at the Alessandro Trailhead would compensate for any changes in use.

4.3.2 Cultural and Historic Resources

Bautista Canyon Archaeological District

Affected Environment

A total of 15 prehistoric and protohistoric (i.e., resources associated with early Native American occupation) archaeological resources, as identified in Section 3.8, would be affected by the proposed project. Each is eligible for listing in the NRHP under Criterion (d) of Section106 of the NHPA because they have the potential to yield information important to prehistory or history. Sites BC-3, BC-4, BC-6, BC-7, BC-14, and BC-15/20 individually and collectively contain important information on chronology, settlement and subsistence, and Native American land use of Bautista Canyon. Sites BC-8 and BC-13 contribute important information regarding the patterning of plant resource collecting and processing, and sites BC-1, BC-9, BC-10, BC-16, BC-18, and BC-21 contribute information related to lithic technology and exploitation of lithic resources in the canyon. The archaeological resources of the canyon as a whole have generally good integrity, and the overall pattern of aboriginal land use remains intact (SRI 2003). A description of each site is found in Table 3.8-1. There is evidence of some vandalism in the form of unauthorized excavation and artifact collection at site BC-3. Portions of sites BC-6 and BC-7 have been disturbed by road construction and maintenance, and OHV use.

The pattern of prehistoric and protohistoric archaeological sties, along with specific and general plant collection areas important in Native American cultural traditions, reflects Native American use of a landscape that retains integrity of location, setting, materials, feeling, and association that is hardly altered from its period of significance. Therefore, the prehistoric and protohistoric sites recorded in the archaeological studies for this project (SRI 2003), along with several previously recorded archaeological sites (RIV-1889, RIV-3090, RIV-3091, and RIV-3092) immediately adjoining the study area in the CDC Bautista Conservation Camp, are considered elements of an archaeological district.

Environmental Consequences

Implementation of Alternatives A, B, and C could cause direct physical destruction or damage to seven archaeological sites. These are: BC-7, BC-9, BC-4, BC-13, BC-3, BC-16; and BC-1. Preliminary designs would have affected site BC-6 also; however, the portion of the project in the vicinity of that site has been realigned to avoid the site completely. A detailed discussion regarding effects and disturbance to these sites is described in Section 3.8, Cultural Resources.

Title 23 CFR § 771.135(g)(2) states that:

> *Section 4(f) does not apply to archeological sites where the Administration, after consultation with the SHPO and the ACHP, determines that the archeological resource is important chiefly because of what can be learned by data recovery and has minimal value for preservation in place. This exception applies both to situation where data recovery is undertaken or where the administration decides, with agreement of the SHPO and, where applicable, the ACHP not to recover the resource.*

Each of the affected sites is eligible for listing in the NRHP only under Criterion (d) of Section106. Therefore, Section 4(f) does not apply to these sites. Section 4(f) requirements apply to an archaeological district the same as they do to an archaeological site (only where preservation in place is warranted). In addition, Section 4(f) would not apply if, after consultation with the SHPO and the ACHP, it is determined that the project occupies only a part of the district that is important chiefly because of what can be learned by data recovery and has minimal value for preservation in place, provided such portion could be occupied without adversely affecting the integrity of the archaeological district. Therefore, Section 4(f) does not apply to the Bautista Canyon Archaeological District.

Anza NHT Historic Transportation Corridor

Affected Environment

Bautista Canyon Road (BC-23) is a historical-period cultural resource in its own right, having been constructed during 1914-1917, and a portion of an apparent earlier alignment (BC-22) may date to the 1890's. These two historic period sites listed in Table 3.8-1 are eligible for listing under Criteria (a) and (b) of the NHPA because of their association with events and persons that have made significant contributions to history. Because the historic landscape of Bautista Canyon is virtually intact and possesses integrity of setting, feeling, and association, sites BC-23 and BC-22 are considered contributing elements of a larger historic transportation

corridor known as the Juan Bautista de Anza National Historic Trail. The period of significance for BC-23 extends from 1774-1917 and is considered significant at a local, state, and national level, while the period of significance for BC-22 extends from 1890-1925 and is considered significant at the local level. The historic transportation corridor is a dynamic cultural feature evolving from prehistoric Native American use, passage of the Anza expedition, use by cattlemen to move stock from the valley to mountain pastures, use as a wagon road, and later improved to an automobile road.

Environmental Consequences

As discussed in Section 3.8, each build alternative would result in an adverse effect to the historic transportation corridor due to visual impacts to the historic landscape. The proposed road would dominate the existing landscape in all aspects including form, line, color, and texture and it would change the landscape character of the canyon. The proposed cuts and fills would dominate as a negative feature along the road edges and change the natural form, line, color, and texture of the existing landscape, degrading the natural scenery of the canyon. Paving of this segment of the roadway would also reduce the rustic characteristic of the roadway.

Avoidance Alternatives

Alternative D "No Action" would leave Bautista Canyon Road in its current condition, avoiding the visual impacts to the historic landscape. The existing road and traffic conditions along Bautista Canyon Road are expected to worsen as traffic volumes increase. Current roadway maintenance would continue and adequate maintenance would become increasingly more expensive as the deficient aspects of the road remain unrepaired. This alternative is not prudent.

The Pave Existing Bautista Canyon Road Alternative would avoid visual impacts to the historic landscape, but there would still be impacts to the rustic characteristic of the roadway. However, this alternative is not prudent for the reasons indicated in Section 4.2.4 above.

The Reconstruct and No Pave Alternative would partially avoid visual impacts by maintaining a more rustic roadway surface. However, this alternative is not prudent for the reasons indicated in Section 4.2.4 above.

The New Route Using Existing Streets Alternative, utilizing existing roads such as SH 371 to SH 74 to the east or SH 371 to Wilson Valley Road/Sage Road/State Street to the west, would totally avoid impacts to the historic transportation corridor, similar to Alternative D. However, this alternative is not prudent for the reasons indicated in Section 4.2.4 above.

The Alternative Transit Alternative would avoid the visual impacts to the historic landscape, similar to Alternative D. However, this alternative is not prudent for the reasons indicated in Section 4.2.4 above.

Measures to Minimize Harm

The visual effect of large fills can be reduced with appropriate revegetation. The proposed design minimizes cut and fill slopes; thus, reducing the project's footprint and the amount of new disturbance. All disturbed areas and abandoned road segments would be revegetated with plant species native to the canyon where possible. On steeper slopes and rock faces, rock coloring would be used to minimize visual effects. Measures to minimize adverse effects are described in detail in Section 3.8.5 (cultural resources) and Section 3.10.5 (visual resources).

Bautista Canyon Traditional Cultural Property (TCP)

Affected Environment

The ethnobotanical resource of the canyon, including basketry material collecting locations (BC-6 and BC-4), and the ethnographical landscape that contains them, and the associated prehistoric and protohistoric archaelological resources, are important in maintaining the cultural identity of the local Cahuilla people and other traditional practitioners. The Cahuilla have historically and still use numerous plants for food, medicine, construction, and utilitarian purposes. The Cahuilla and other tribes in the area value the isolated setting and serenity with the low traffic volume that exists in Bautista Canyon, where prayers are said before they collect plants. Tribal members often come to Bautista Canyon to collect plants. The unpaved segment of Bautista Canyon Road is located mainly along the bottom of the canyon near Bautista Creek, which provides convenient access to plant collecting areas. Table 3.8-2 provides a brief summary of each plant species that were used by the Cahuilla.

The canyon is considered to be eligible for listing in the NRHP as a TCP under Criterion (c) of the NHPA (CSRI 2003). The boundaries of the TCP minimally include the study corridor for the ethnobotanical study (i.e., 500 m [1,640 ft] on each side of the road for the length proposed project). Although Native Americans consulted during the course of cultural resources studies consider the TCP to include the entire canyon, it is not feasible to define the boundaries beyond the area investigated.

Environmental Consequences

Access changes associated with implementation of Alternative A, B, or C would result in adverse effects to plant collecting areas. Changes in the road's alignment would create new accessible areas, while reducing access to existing accessible areas. All of the build alternatives would result in higher speeds, grade changes, and steep embankment slopes that would make it more difficult for traditional practitioners to pull off the road and/or access some plant areas.

The proposed build alternatives would introduce noise and visual intrusions that may affect the serenity currently associated with plant gathering in Bautista Canyon, thus diminishing the integrity of the setting, feeling, and association of the TCP. The proposed road would dominate the existing landscape in all aspects including form, line, color, and texture and it would change the landscape character of the canyon. The proposed cuts and fills would dominate as a negative feature along the road edges and change the natural form, line, color, and texture of

the existing landscape, degrading the natural scenery of the canyon. Large cuts that are mostly composed of exposed rock would remain a negative visual impact for decades if left untreated. The proposed alternatives would also add increased traffic through the canyon as described in more detail in Section 3.3.

Avoidance Alternatives

Alternative D "No Action" would leave Bautista Canyon Road in its current condition; avoiding the visual impacts and intrusions and would not change the existing access practitioners have to plant collection sites. The existing road and traffic conditions along Bautista Canyon Road are expected to worsen as traffic volumes increase. Noise would continue to worsen as well. Current roadway maintenance would continue and adequate maintenance would become increasingly more expensive as the deficient aspects of the road remain unrepaired. This alternative is not prudent.

The Pave Existing Bautista Canyon Road Alternative, New Route Using Existing Streets Alternative, and Alternative Transit Alternative, similar to Alternative D, would avoid visual impacts and intrusions and would not change the existing access practitioners have to plant collection sites. However, traffic condition and noise would continue to worsen as traffic volumes increase. These alternatives are not prudent for the reasons indicated in Section 4.2.4 above.

Measures to Minimize Harm

The proposed build alternatives have been redesigned with steeper slopes in several locations to avoid direct adverse effects to plants in known basketry material and medicinal plant collecting areas, particularly with regard to Juncus stands located at sites BC-6 and BC-4. A comprehensive revegetation program would be implemented with all the build alternatives to mitigate the loss of existing vegetation. Mitigation for impacted plant communities would occur at approximately a 1:1 area ratio through the revegetation of the abandoned road segments (see Tables 3.6-6 and 3.6-7). Revegation would be accomplished using species native to the canyon. The program would include appropriate seed mixes corresponding to the adjacent plant community. In consultation with Native American tribes, the SBNF, NPS, SHPO, and ACHP, a MOA would be prepared containing provisions for the FHWA and the County of Riverside to prepare and implement a treatment plan for archaeological sites subject to direct adverse effects. The treatment plan would be designed to enhance the growth and distribution of desirable species and minimize changes in the canyon setting of the project. The measures listed above are discussed in more detail in Section 3.6, Biological Resources and Section 3.8, Cultural Resources.

4.4 Alternatives That Avoid All Section 4(f) Resources

4.4.1 Alternative D, No Action

Alternative D would leave Bautista Canyon Road in its current condition. The existing deficient characteristics of the roadway would remain. The existing road and traffic conditions along

Bautista Canyon Road are expected to worsen as traffic volumes increase. Current maintenance of the roadway would continue and adequate maintenance would become increasingly expensive as the deficient aspects of the road remain unrepaired. This alternative does not address the purpose and need for the project and is not prudent. It should be noted that although this alternative does not involve use of land from Section 4(f) resources, it does have indirect impacts on those resources, such as increasing noise due to traffic increases and ongoing impacts to archaeological sites.

4.4.2 New Route Using Existing Streets

The New Route Using Existing Streets Alternative, utilizing existing roads such as SH 371 to SH 74 to the east or SH 371 to Wilson Valley Road/Sage Road/State Street to the west, would avoid all Section 4(f) resources. The existing traffic conditions along Bautista Canyon Road would continue, and current maintenance of the roadway would continue. This alternative would not adequately address safety and maintenance needs on the existing road, or meet the purpose of and need for the project. Therefore, implementation of this alternative would not be prudent.

4.4.3 Limited Access Alternative

Bautista Canyon Road would be limited to Forest Service access and Native American plant collection from just south of the Conservation camp to just north of Tripp Flats Road. Cul-de-sacs would be constructed at these locations along with access gates. The Forest Service would control the gates at these locations and would coordinate with the Native Americans concerning their access. Alternative routes, SH 74 to SH 371 and/or State Street to Sage Road, would be improved to handle the additional traffic volume diverted from Bautista Canyon Road. The degree of improvements to these roadways would be determined based on the existing roadway's ability to handle the additional traffic.

This alternative is not prudent because it would remove a transportation link in the County's circulation system which is inconsistent with the County's General Plan, specifically with REMAP policy 8.1 and 8.7; it would remove one potential access route out of the Anza Valley in the event of a fire; it would not provide an improved road surface that would allow for faster travel by fire-fighting equipment, improved access by Forest Service enforcement vehicles, and County Sheriff vehicles; it would not allow the public to travel by automobile through a portion of the SBNF that had been available and planned for such use and access to the existing Alessandro Trail would be restricted; and improvements to SR 74/SR 371 and/or State St/Sage Rd would have potentially significant environmental impacts which would have to be addressed.

4.5 Summary of Impacts to Section 4(f) Properties

Table 4.5-1 summarizes the impacts to Section 4(f) properties. With one exception, all the build alternatives would result in similar impacts to Section 4(f) properties: Alternative B would result in the greatest impact because the required earthwork would create the largest amount new land disturbance and therefore the largest visual impact.

Table 4.5-1
Summary of Impacts to Section 4(f) Properties

Alternative	Feasible and Prudent	Harm to Anza NHT	Harm to Alessandro Trail	Harm to Archaeological District (No Section 4(f) impact)	Harm to Historic Transportation Corridor	Harm to TCP
A	Yes	Medium	Low	--	High	High
B	Yes	High	Low	--	High	High
C	Yes	Medium	Low	--	High	High
D	No	Avoids	Avoids	--	Avoids	Partially Avoids
Proposed Variations to Build Alternatives	No	Does Not Avoid	Does Not Avoid	--	Does Not Avoid	Does Not Avoid
Pave Existing Bautista Canyon Road	No	Partially Avoids	Does Not Avoid	--	Partially Avoids	Partially Avoids
Reconstruct and No Pave	No	Partially Avoids	Does Not Avoid	--	Partially Avoids	Does Not Avoid
New Route Using Existing Streets	No	Avoids	Avoids	--	Avoids	Partially Avoids
New Route Through Bautista Canyon	No	Does Not Avoid	Avoids	--	Does Not Avoid	Does Not Avoid
25 or 32 km/h (15 or 20 mph) Design Speed for Entire Route	No	Does Not Avoid	Does Not Avoid	--	Does Not Avoid	Does Not Avoid
Alternative Transit	No	Avoids	Avoids	--	Avoids	Partially Avoids

km/h – kilometers per hour
mph – miles per hour
NHT – National Historic Trail
TCP – Traditional Cultural Property

4.6 Coordination

The FHWA and the County of Riverside have worked closely with the SBNF, NPS, local Native American tribes, and other practitioners of traditional Native American culture throughout this environmental process and the design phases to assure that all reasonable consideration for protection and enhancement of the Section 4(f) resources are carefully considered. To date, this coordination has taken the form of meetings, field reviews, and correspondence over a 3-year period that began in 2001. Coordination meetings and field reviews will continue throughout the environmental review process. Project coordination and efforts are summarized in Section 1.2.4, Public Involvement Process, and Volume II, Appendix B, Scoping Comments.

4.6.1 Juan Bautista de Anza National Historic Trail

Meredith M. Kaplan, NPS Superintendent of the Anza NHT, accompanied staff from Statistical Research, Inc. (SRI), the County of Riverside, SBNF, and FHWA on several field trips to the project area to review preliminary alignments and discuss issues of concern to the NPS regarding use of the Anza NHT, along with possible project effects and opportunities for integration of interpretive information and facilities into project design. The NPS was also invited to participate in SEE team meetings and be a cooperating agency under NEPA due to their special expertise in the NHT.

4.6.2 Alessandro Trail

The FHWA and the County of Riverside have worked closely with the SBNF throughout this environmental process and the design phases to assure that protection and enhancement of the Section 4(f) resources are carefully considered. The SBNF prepared a conceptual design for the new parking area for the Alessandro Trailhead.

4.6.3 Archaeological Resources and TCP Resources

On 16 April 2001, a meeting with local Native American tribes was held (Table 1.2-2). In response to the consultation, concerns were raised from several tribes and traditional practitioners about the potential effects of the project on areas used for collecting basketry materials, medicinal plants, and other botanical resources. A field meeting attended by 11 Native Americans representing four area tribes and the Southern California Indian Basketweavers Organization was held on 9 March 2002 to review the proposed project alignment and visit archaeological sites and plant-collection areas. On the basis of concerns expressed during the field review, the FHWA revised the project alignment to avoid one of the larger plant-collecting areas associated with archaeological site BC-6. In addition, the County of Riverside contracted with Cultural Systems Research, Inc. (CSRI), to prepare an ethnobotanical study to document the level of plant usage and potential effects of the project on botanical resources.

The traditional practitioners who attended the field review were invited to a meeting on 3 August 2002 to review the work plan for archaeological testing and to consider the approach to be used for the ethnobotanical study. Members of Santa Rosa and Cahuilla reservations

attended the August meeting, where arrangements were made for archaeological monitoring and field trips regarding ethnobotanical investigations.

Members of the Ramona Reservation Tribal Council were invited to a field review of the project on 16 December 2002. During the review, attended by one council member, archaeological sites and plant-collecting areas were visited. Members of Ramona, Cahuilla, and Santa Rosa reservations have expressed interest in reviewing the draft cultural resources assessment. Copies of the draft cultural report were sent to the local Native American tribes and other practitioners of traditional Native American culture for their review and input. An ethnobotanical field study was conducted on 22 November 2003. In attendance were representatives from the SBNF, SRI, and representatives from the following groups: Pala, Soboba, Ramona Band of Cahuilla Indians, Cahuilla Band of Mission Indians, and Santa Rosa.

Several individuals with knowledge about the cultural resources of the project area were consulted. These include Daniel F. McCarthy, SBNF Tribal Relations Program Manager and former Acting Heritage Resources Program Manager; Douglas Pumphrey, former District Ranger for the SBNF San Jacinto District, and Meredith Kaplan, Superintendent of the Juan Bautista de Anza National Historic Trail.

Local historians consulted were Ann and Billing Jennings, and Phil Brigandi, all of Hemet. They provided many suggestions for research materials, and Mr. Brigandi reviewed his files of local newspapers for stories related to Bautista Canyon.

Consultations between the FHWA and California SHPO are ongoing, and are expected to result in signing of a MOA regarding any adverse effects of the project on historic properties. The FHWA will continue to consult with the ACHP, and other signatories to implement the terms of the MOA.

4.6.4 Archaeological Resources and TCP Resources

On 16 April 2001, a meeting with local Native American tribes was held (Table 1.2-2). In response to the consultation, concerns were raised from several tribes and traditional practitioners about the potential effects of the project on areas used for collecting basketry materials, medicinal plants, and other botanical resources. A field meeting attended by 11 Native Americans representing four area tribes and the Southern California Indian Basketweavers Organization was held on 9 March 2002 to review the proposed project alignment and visit archaeological sites and plant-collection areas. On the basis of concerns expressed during the field review, the FHWA revised the project alignment to avoid one of the larger plant-collecting areas associated with archaeological site BC-6. In addition, the County of Riverside contracted with Cultural Systems Research, Inc. (CSRI), to prepare an ethnobotanical study to document the level of plant usage and potential effects of the project on botanical resources.

The traditional practitioners who attended the field review were invited to a meeting on 3 August 2002 to review the work plan for archaeological testing and to consider the approach to be used for the ethnobotanical study. Members of Santa Rosa and Cahuilla reservations attended the August meeting, where arrangements were made for archaeological monitoring and field trips regarding ethnobotanical investigations.

Members of the Ramona Reservation Tribal Council were invited to a field review of the project on 16 December 2002. During the review, attended by one council member, archaeological sites and plant-collecting areas were visited. Members of Ramona, Cahuilla, and Santa Rosa reservations have expressed interest in reviewing the draft cultural resources assessment. Copies of the draft cultural report were sent to the local Native American tribes and other practitioners of traditional Native American culture for their review and input. An ethnobotanical field study was conducted on 22 November 2003. In attendance were representatives from the SBNF, SRI, and representatives from the following groups: Pala, Soboba, Ramona Band of Cahuilla Indians, Cahuilla Band of Mission Indians, and Santa Rosa.

Several individuals with knowledge about the cultural resources of the project area were consulted. These include Daniel F. McCarthy, SBNF Tribal Relations Program Manager and former Acting Heritage Resources Program Manager; Douglas Pumphrey, former District Ranger for the SBNF San Jacinto District, and Meredith Kaplan, Superintendent of the Juan Bautista de Anza National Historic Trail.

Local historians consulted were Ann and Billing Jennings, and Phil Brigandi, all of Hemet. They provided many suggestions for research materials, and Mr. Brigandi reviewed his files of local newspapers for stories related to Bautista Canyon.

Consultations between the FHWA and California SHPO are ongoing, and are expected to result in signing of a MOA regarding any adverse effects of the project on historic properties. The FHWA will continue to consult with the ACHP, and other signatories to implement the terms of the MOA during design and construction phases of the proposed project.